

LyleMcCandless@aol.com

08/29/2010 03:10 PM

To damon_doumlele@nps.gov, jpg2esq@gmail.com,
lylemccandless@aol.com, chuck.collins@myfwc.com,
wclark88@aol.com, cmorehead@moodyjones.com,
dcharland@trcintl.com, captfrankadams@aol.com,
bob_degross@nps.gov, karl_greer@fpl.com,
cypresshunter99@yahoo.com, wayjen2500@msn.com,
LJMoller@aol.com, barjnpwll@aol.com

cc

Subject Lyle's Response to Pedro TRV

Damon:

Would you please post the attached ORV related letter on the ORVAC web site.

Thanks



Lyle Lyle's Response TRU.html

Good Afternoon Pedro:

Very impressed to see you working on Sunday.

In your letter you stated "the trail network we implemented in the Turner River is a work in progress". The word "implemented" is past tense indicating the deal is done as opposed to a work in progress. We are hopeful that this was just a typo and the Turner River ORV trails is a work in progress.

Considering the mess we have currently regarding the minimal 55 miles of Secondary ORV trails in the Turner River unit, together with the fact that the Turner River ORV trails are far from being properly identified and marked your idea of putting together a working subcommittee including the Public and the FWC is a very good idea. The only thing is that subcommittee needs to be put together NOW. The problem exists NOW and needs to be addressed NOW. Your idea of proposing this to the ORVAC for their consideration in the October meeting would mean they chew on it for a meeting or two and all the sudden we are down the road another month or two or three. This situation needs to be addressed promptly. I strongly encourage the Public, the ORVAC members and the FWC to contact Superintendent Ramos regarding putting this subcommittee together sooner rather than later.

In your letter you stated "One very important thing that we all must remember is that we do have an ORV plan that guides us with specific parameters and limits regarding mileage, trail criteria, and otherwise".

1. "limits regarding mileage". There is NO limit on total miles of Secondary trails in the ORV Plan.
2. "trail criteria" Even though we have formally requested it we have seen NO science based "trail criteria" in the elimination of any of the requested ORV trails in the Turner River unit.
3. "and otherwise" I suppose we would be safe to assume the new word "Feasible" fits this category.

In your letter you stated "making sure we are all reading from the same page" the page reads that there is no limit of total miles of Secondary Trails, No limit on number of individual Secondary trails and it was clearly established that "short distance" would be plus or minus one and one half miles. If the Park Service was on this page "the official page" and followed these clear guidelines we would not be in the mess we are today regarding ORV trails in the Turner River unit.

In your letter you stated "I would be happy to join folks for a meeting" I would be willing to participated in a meeting providing everyone realizes the "horse is dead" and we could expect to hear something new. In

my opinion it would be much more productive for all to work toward getting the above suggested subcommittee implemented.

Pedro's letter attached.

Sincerely

Lyle McCandless
Native Floridian
Pres. BCSA
Member DMTAG